

**CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM
STATEMENT OF INVESTMENT POLICY**

**FOR
CREDIT ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM**

June 16, 2008

This Policy is effective immediately upon adoption and supersedes all previous Credit Enhancement Program Policies.

I. PURPOSE

The CalPERS Total Fund Statement of Investment Policy adopted by the CalPERS Investment Committee ("Committee"), sets forth CalPERS' overarching investment purposes and objectives with respect to all its investment programs.

This document sets forth the investment policy ("Policy") for the Credit Enhancement Program ("Program"). The design of this Policy ensures that investors, managers, consultants, and other participants selected by the California Public Employees' Retirement System ("CalPERS") take prudent and careful action while managing the Program. Additionally, use of this Policy assures sufficient flexibility in managing investment risks and returns associated with the management and oversight of the Program.

II. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

The Program shall be managed to accomplish the following:

Earning fee income through a zero loss-underwriting standard. Fees will be generated from [annual commitments](#), [up-front closings](#), [amendments](#), and [waivers](#).

CalPERS' expects strict conformity with the Policy and will allow the market to set pricing for [credit enhancement](#) vehicles.

III. RESPONSIBILITIES

A. CalPERS' Investment Staff ("Staff") is responsible for the following:

1. All aspects of portfolio management, including monitoring, analyzing, and evaluating performance;
2. Reporting to the Committee annually and more often, if necessary, about the performance of the Program;

3. Monitoring the implementation of, and compliance with, the Policy. Staff shall report, orally or in writing, concerns, problems, material changes, and all violations of the Policy immediately to the [Senior Investment Officer](#) ("SIO")
 4. Preparing a [Prudence Certificate](#) for each transaction.
- B. The [General Pension Consultant](#) is responsible for monitoring, evaluating, and reporting periodically (at least once annually), to the Committee, on the performance of the Program.

IV. VIOLATION REPORTING

- A. The violation reporting process shall be as follows:
1. Staff shall report orally, or in writing, all Policy violations immediately to the Senior Investment Officer, Global Fixed Income Unit.
 2. The Senior Investment Officer, Global Fixed Income Unit (SIO) shall immediately report orally, or in writing, any Policy violation to the [Chief Investment Officer](#) (CIO), and the Chief Operating Investment Officer.
 3. The CIO shall determine the appropriate means of further reporting based on his or her judgment of the magnitude, sensitivity and severity of the violation.
 - a. All Policy violations shall be reported to the Committee as part of a quarterly report agenda item on the Committee's regular agenda.
 - b. Depending on the Policy violation, and at the discretion of the CIO, reporting may also be made to the Committee as a separate agenda item or as a portion of the CIO Report at the next scheduled Committee meeting. These reports shall include explanations of the violations and appropriate recommendations for corrective action.
 - c. If a Policy violation is to be reported to the Committee, the Consultant shall be asked to provide an opinion as to the impact of the Policy violation to the Program and overall fund.

V. INVESTMENT APPROACHES AND PARAMETERS

A. Eligible vehicles for credit enhancement:

1. [Letters of Credit](#) – These are [irrevocable](#) obligations used to provide credit and liquidity on [variable](#) or fixed rate [note](#) and [bond](#) transactions. The legal obligation to fund under these documents is **unconditional**. Letters of Credit are irrevocable draws by the [Trustee](#) and will be funded according to the established funding procedures.
2. [Lines of Credit](#) – These are also referred to as [Standby Bond or Note Purchase Agreements](#) or [Liquidity Lines](#). These are designed to provide liquidity (as opposed to credit enhancement) in the event of financial market disruption. The legal obligation to fund under these vehicles is **conditional**. These are also referred to as revocable vehicles

B. Exclusions:

1. CalPERS will not provide direct- funded loans.
2. The Program will not consider transactions with municipal issuers or conduit issuers on their behalf (obligors) that have declared bankruptcy in the last fifteen years.
3. The Program will not consider [Certificates of Participations \(COPs\)](#) other than those transactions for [Essential Municipal Services](#).

C. Credit [Ratings](#):

1. All issuers under the Program shall be rated [investment grade](#) by at least two [nationally-recognized credit rating agencies](#) (e.g., [Moody's](#), [Investors Service](#), [Standard and Poor's](#) and [Fitch Ratings](#)) and any outstanding rating must be investment grade by at least two nationally-recognized credit rating agencies. In addition, such an issuer should not have been rated in the non-investment grade category by any nationally-recognized credit rating agencies at any time within the last five years.
2. If an issuer is not initially rated, an independent [Rating Category Determination \(RCD\) letter](#) shall be procured from at least two nationally-recognized credit rating agencies. The RCD will provide a determination as to whether a proposed transaction is of investment grade quality.

D. Credit Rating Portfolio Limits:

1. The average credit quality of the Program's portfolio shall be "single-A" long-term [credit rating](#) designation (A2 by Moody's, A by S&P and A by Fitch. See Appendix I for equivalent ratings by Moody's, S&P and Fitch).
2. Where a credit transaction has a [split rating](#), i.e. BBB+/A- from two or more credit rating agencies, Staff shall use the lower rating for purposes of calculating the average credit quality of the Program's portfolio.

E. Portfolio Average Maturity

The weighted average maturity of the Program's portfolio shall not exceed 5 years.

F. Portfolio Diversification

1. Geographic Distribution

- a. *Philosophy:* Municipalities in ten States – **California, New York, Florida, New Jersey, Texas, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan and Ohio** -- have the largest municipal issuance volume and have consistently been in the "top-ten" states for municipal issuance for at least the last ten years. The Program's portfolio will be aligned with states having the largest populations and largest municipal issuance volume.
- b. *Implementation:* Staff will construct a credit enhancement portfolio, using an aggregate dollar total, that will be distributed on a parallel basis to municipal issuance across the entire market with limitations as shown in Table 1 below.

2. [Direct State Government Issued Debt](#) Limits (Table 1)

- a. *Philosophy:* The overall mission of the Program is to earn fee income on an expected zero loss-underwriting basis. The Program envisions the majority of primary obligors to be municipalities, not state governments.
- b. *Implementation:* To further control risks and increase portfolio diversification, Direct State Government Issued Debt (voter or non-voter approved) shall not exceed 40% of

the Total Aggregate Program Portfolio within a particular state.

Table 1: State Geographic Distribution and Debt Limits

State Geographic Distribution	Percentage of Aggregate Program Portfolio	Direct State Government Issued Debt Limits
California	Not to exceed 45%	Not to exceed 18%
New York	Not to exceed 35%	Not to exceed 14%
Florida	Not to exceed 30%	Not to exceed 12%
All Other States*	Not to exceed 20%	Not to exceed 8%

* Includes the other 47 states and US Territories & Possessions (Guam, Midway Islands, Puerto Rico, US Virgin Islands and Wake Islands)

3. Municipal Sector Exposure

- a. *Philosophy:* Only those entities rated investment grade within the traditional municipal sectors, secured by revenues from the particular entity or back-stopped by the taxing [authority](#) of the municipality, and with demonstrated low [default](#) rates will be eligible for the Program.
- b. *Implementation:* The Program's portfolio exposure within each state shall be diversified through transactions in different municipal market sectors. All of the issuers within the portfolio shall come from one of the outlined governmental and public sectors below (including [non-profit 501\(c\)\(3\) institutions](#)) that comprise the U.S. municipal market:

For any [issuer](#) which is a public agency employer for purposes of participation in CalPERS credit enhancement program or entity that might become a public agency employer, a written opinion of counsel for issuer is required that either:

- i. Issuer's securities are exempt pursuant to Section 3(a)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 (as [security](#) issued by a state or any political subdivision of a state or by any public instrumentality of a state or any political subdivision thereof); or

- ii. Issuer's securities are exempt pursuant to section 3(a)(4) of the Securities Act of 1933 (the 501(c)(3) exemption).

Table 2: Municipal Sector Limits

Sector Nos.	Market Sectors	Percentage of Total Aggregate Program Portfolio
1	General Obligation /Short Term General Fund/Cash Flow Notes	Not to Exceed 100%
2	Public Infrastructure, Facilities and Equipment	Not to Exceed 80%
3	Transportation and Highway	Not to Exceed 70%
4	Water and Waste Water	Not to Exceed 70%
5	Education	Not to Exceed 60%
6	Municipal Utility Systems	Not to Exceed 50%
7	Airport and Marine Ports	Not to Exceed 40%
8	Student Loan and Pooled Loan Programs	Not to Exceed 30%
9	Housing	Not to Exceed 25%
10	Securitization Programs	Not to Exceed 15%
11	Public-Supported Stadiums/Arenas	Not to Exceed 15%
12	Solid Waste Facilities/Resource Recovery/Environmental	Not to Exceed 10%
13	Healthcare	Not to Exceed 10%
14	Other*	Not to Exceed 10%

* This category is established for exceptions to the Policy. It is desirable to respond to changing market conditions and to take advantage of key opportunities that might not specifically fit into the Policy. .

4. [Special Assessment Districts](#)

- a. *Philosophy:* Some studies have generally categorized Special Assessment Districts as having a higher default profile in the [municipal bond](#) market.
- b. *Implementation:* Accordingly, the Program shall only consider such tax allocation/[special assessment bonds](#) with the following characteristics:
 - i) The location is within the geographic region or city limit of a substantial, investment grade rated entity with an identifiable level of past and likely future growth and demand for housing and related infrastructure;
 - ii) The District is not a “start-up”, with at least five years of existing track record and debt servicing record;

- iii) Raw land sales have been steady or increasingly strong due to demographic demand and population growth; and
- iv) The developer or sponsor is of investment grade quality with excellent debt repayment history and strong construction/management experience.

G. Program Transaction Limits

The maximum holding in any given transaction in California shall be 25% of the issue in order to be in compliance with the [Safe Harbor rules](#) established under Section 503(e) of the Internal Revenue Code (IRC).

H. Program Partnerships

The Program shall co-invest with at least one [Financial Partner](#) on each transaction. The Financial Partner(s) shall contribute to a sizeable interest on the transaction.

VI. CALCULATIONS AND COMPUTATIONS

- A. Computations and calculation shall be based upon the total aggregate amount of \$10 billion committed to the Program.
- B. The “[primary obligor](#)” shall be used in computing geographic distribution limits, direct State government issued [debt limits](#) and municipal market sector limits.

VII. GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Key words used in the policy are defined in CalPERS’ Master Glossary of Terms.

Approved by the Policy Subcommittee:	September 12, 2003
Adopted by the Investment Committee:	October 14, 2003
Revised by the Policy Subcommittee:	December 10, 2004
Approved by the Investment Committee:	February 14, 2005
Revised by the Policy Subcommittee:	June 16, 2006
Approved by the Investment Committee:	August 14, 2006
Revised by the Policy Subcommittee:	October 12, 2007
Approved by the Investment Committee:	November 13, 2007
Approved by the Investment Committee:	June 16, 2008

APPENDIX I

Equivalent Credit Ratings

Credit Risk	Moody's*	Standard & Poor's**	Fitch**
INVESTMENT GRADE			
Highest quality	Aaa	AAA	AAA
High quality (very strong)	Aa	AA	AA
Upper medium grade (strong)	A	A	A
Medium grade	Baa	BBB	BBB
NON-INVESTMENT GRADE			
Lower medium grade (somewhat speculative)	Ba	BB	BB
Low grade (speculative)	B	B	B
Poor quality (may default)	Caa	CCC	CCC
Most speculative	Ca	CC	CC
No interest being paid or bankruptcy petition filed	C	C	C
In default	C	D	D

Source: The Bond Market Association

* The ratings from Aa to Ca by Moody's may be modified by the addition of a 1,2 or 3 to show relative standing within the category.

** The ratings from AA to CC by Standard and Poor's and Fitch may be modified by the addition of a plus or minus sign to show relative standing within the category.